DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 064 237 SP 005 722

AUTHOR Tittle, Carol Kehr
TITLE Program Priorities in Teacher Education.
PUB DATE Apr 72
NOTE 7p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Assn., Chicago, April 1972

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Innovation; *Educational Programs; Measurement Instruments; Performance Based Teacher Education; *Program Development; *Program Proposals; Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

As part of a project to develop recommendations for program developments in teacher education, a number of program proposals were developed by members of the Committee on National Program Priorities in Teacher Education (CNPPTE). Abstracts of the program proposals were prepared and circulated to critics who were asked to rate separately the major ideas in the abstracts. The purpose of the ratings was to guide the development of final Committee recommendations and to assist Committee members in further development of individual program proposals. The list of critics to review and rate ideas was developed from names submitted by CNPPTE members and U.S. Office of Education staff. The reviewers represented school and community groups, school administrators and teachers, critics of teacher education, associations for professional groups in education, and university faculty and administrators. A total of 70 abstracts was mailed and 38 were returned. Reviewers also suggested ideas which they felt had been overlooked. Results indicated three items rated as critical concerns by 80 per cent of the reviewers: establishment of performance-based teacher education programs, development of measuring instruments for knowledge, skills and observation of teaching methods and personalization of teacher training programs. Five additional items were rated critical by at least 60 per cent of the group. Additional suggestions and concerns are included. (Related Document 005 318) (MJM)

ED 064237

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Program Priorities in Teacher Education

Carol Kehr Tittle, City University of New York

Introduction

As part of a project to develop recommendations for program developments in teacher education for USOE-BEPD and Task Force '72, a number of program proposals were developed by members of the Committee on National Program Priorities in Teacher Education (CNPPTE).* Abstracts of the program proposals were prepared and circulated to a set of critics. The major ideas in the abstracts were presented separately as items to be rated. The purpose of the ratings was to guide the development of the final Committee recommendations and to assist Committee members in further development of individual program proposals. The ratings, however, are of more general interest in indicating the importance of proposed program developments for teacher education, and the conflicting views of those concerned with teacher education in the definition of "accountability" for the profession and approaches to change.

Method

The list of external critics to review and rate ideas was developed from names submitted by CNPPTE members and USOE staff. The reviewers represented school and community groups, school administrators and teachers, critics of teacher education, associations for professional groups in education, and university faculty and administrators. Some reviewers were selected since they were knowledgeable about five developmental programs in USOE: protocol materials, training materials, training complexes, the Models for Elementary Teacher Education, and performance-based certification. A total of 70 abstracts were mailed and 38 returned (54% response), as shown in Table 1 below. In addition to the ratings of items, reviewers suggested ideas which they felt had been overlooked.

---

*Committee membership included: Benjamin Rosner, City University of New York; Richard Turner, Indiana University; H. Del Schalock, Oregon State System of Higher Education; M. Vere DeVault, University of Wisconsin; Saul B. Cohen, Clark University; and Charles E. Stewart, Detroit Public Schools. The report of the Committee -- The Power of Competency-Based Teacher Education -- will be forthcoming from Allyn and Bacon, late Spring, 1972.

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association in Chicago, Illinois, April, 1972.

SP005722

Table 1. Distribution of Reviewers

Group	Number Mailed	Number Returned
Institutions of Higher Education		
Education Deans/Faculty	27	14
Liberal Arts	7	1
State Education Departments	3	3
School Superintendents	10	7
Teachers/ Professional Associations	4	2
Teacher Education Associations	6	4
Community Organizations/Critics	8	2
Other Education Groups (R & D Centers, Regional Laboratories)	5	5
Total	70	38

Results

1. Ratings of Major Ideas

The major ideas were rated for their potential utility in the redesign of teacher education programs. The raters were asked to take into account the usefulness of the items as they related to a major goal of OE: to improve the quality of education for disadvantaged minority, racial, and ethnic groups. Items were rated on a scale from 1 (critical item; must be taken into account in designing teacher education programs) to 5 (of little or no interest for redesigning teacher education). The ratings for each item are given in Table 2 (attached).

Items which were rated as critical (given a rating of one or two) by 80% of the group responding were:

#3 Establish performance-based teacher education programs
#9 Develop measuring "instruments" -- knowledge/skills/observation of teaching methods
#23 Personalize or individualize teacher training program.

There appears to be high agreement on the overall goal of the recommendations: developing a program of teacher education which is competency-based. The emphasis on the development of measuring "instruments" recognizes the need to make explicit and provide some type of assessment for the competencies set as goals of programs of teacher education. The agreement on personalizing or individualizing the program seems to emphasize the "means" by which the overall goals are met; that is, this item indicates agreement on some aspects of the process of the teacher education program. Even though these terms (competency-based, "instruments", personalize/individualize) are not well explicated at this stage, the ratings seem to indicate a close agreement (within this limited sample) on some terms currently being used in teacher education.

A second group of items were rated as critical by at least 60% of the individuals responding:

#1 Establish a parity group for policy making
#5 Use training materials
#8 Develop a data-based feedback system for performance following training
#10 Establish training complexes, consortium training centers, parity based teacher centers
#22 Recruit students and adults from minority groups.

Two of these statements have implications for policy guidelines in teacher education programs: the ideas of a parity group and recruiting from minority groups. Two suggest more specific areas for funding and development: training materials and training centers. Agreement on these latter areas may indicate a need to make more concrete or definitive some aspects of teacher education, i.e., through emphasizing the "training" aspects. The item suggesting a 'data-based feedback system' for performance following training also emphasizes a more concrete or explicit approach in part of the teacher education program.

2. Additional Suggestions

Reviewers also suggested ideas which they felt had been overlooked in the presentation of the abstracts of Committee papers. The comments were categorized into areas related to teacher education programs such as general structure, career factors, planning, technical support and program development, etc. Two areas of these comments are discussed here: those relating to the concept of accountability and performance based.

a. performance base

Specific statements made by reviewers related to the idea of performance base included:

> The push to performance-based preparatory programs runs the danger of re-inventing the two-year normal school to train teachers.
>
> Lack of knowledge of the performance-based area should be fully recognized.
>
> We do not have the know-how to prepare fully professionally trained people in performance-based settings.
>
> It must be recognized that competence for teachers exists in a context -- competence is not demonstrated irrespective of situation or context.
>
> Performance or competency based teacher education should place more emphasis on the affective domain of teacher education (i.e., than was apparent in the abstracts of Committee papers).

> It is untenable to expect specific teaching behavior to cause specific pupil learning at a particular time. There are too many 'inputs' in student learning to establish precise and direct cause and effect relationships between teaching and learning.
>
> There is the problem of context in developing the performance-based certification at Criterion Levels 1, 2, and 3.

The last statement refers to a statement by Richard Turner specifying the types of "performance" which can be distinguished: Criterion Level 6 asks that the teacher shows knowledges and understandings; Levels 5 and 4 with the demonstration of pedagogic skills under laboratory or simplified training conditions; Criterion Level 3 with the demonstration of teacher behavior under actual classroom conditions; Criterion Levels 2 and 1 with the demonstration of teacher effectiveness -- that is, with the demonstration that teacher behavior results in change in pupil behavior over the short (say, two weeks) and long term. Most reviewers felt that these distinctions among criterion levels (labelled as criterion levels since they could be used to relate teacher education programs or training to different "levels" of criteria) were valuable in helping to distinguish the basis on which "performance" can be discussed. Most of the comments, however, did not attempt to be specific in identifying or relating these distinctions of criterion levels to more general suggestions about performance base.

b. <u>accountability</u>

Statements made by reviewers related to the idea of accountability included:

> Teacher preparation institutions need to make an effort to validate their programs.
>
> A greater emphasis on accountability is needed so that teacher preparation institutions will validate their efforts.
>
> The university faculty must be held accountable; too little attention to preparation, experience and evaluation of university professors.
>
> Teacher education is accountable to the universities and to the teaching profession, and, broadly, to the public. There is a distinction between accountability and responsiveness to other agencies (schools, etc.)... Schools are established by and accountable to states and communities which found them. There is a distinction between <u>accountability</u> -- to one's founder, and <u>responsiveness</u>, which is to other agencies to which one relates. Teacher education is not accountable to the schools, ... but they do relate to each other.

> There appears to be a confusion between national education goals (student performance objectives) and teacher education objectives (training in behavior shaping).

The statements on accountability reflect several problems -- to whom is teacher education accountable and, broadly speaking, at what criterion level? The comments did suggest that teacher education programs needed to validate their efforts and that there is no consensus on the criterion level for this validation effort. Much of the work of the Committee was aimed at reaching some consensus within the group on these two problems. The group did not reach complete agreement on these issues, and reflected the concerns expressed by reviewers. There appears to be uncertainty about the appropriate criteria for accountability in teacher training. While some reviewers would equate the accountability of the schools with the accountability of teacher education (pupil growth is the only valid criterion for teacher education), others would limit the accountability of teacher education to the preparation of competent teachers.

Table 2. Ratings of Items

After reading the program descriptions included in the set of materials, rate each of the following items for their potential utility in the redesign of teacher education programs, in line with OE objectives, e.g., to improve the quality of education for disadvantaged minority, racial, and ethnic groups.

1 -- critical item; must be taken into account in designing teacher education programs
2 --
3 -- important item, but not as high in priority
4 --
5 -- of little or no interest for redesigning teacher education

ITEM	Frequency of Ratings Given Each Item					
	1	2	3	4	5	NR*
1. Establish a parity group for policy making	16	10	7	2	2	1
2. Apply systems design to teacher education programs	15	7	12	4	-	-
3. Establish performance-based teacher education programs	23	8	4	-	1	2
4. Use protocol materials	7	13	12	4	1	1
5. Use training materials	10	14	9	3	2	-
6. Use the Models for Elementary Teacher Education	7	10	13	4	4	-
7. Develop Educational Service Districts	4	4	15	8	4	3
8. Develop a data-based feedback system for performance following training (Micro Confirmatory Systems)	9	14	8	5	2	-
9. Develop measuring "instruments"--knowledge/skills/observation of teaching behaviors	27	6	3	1	1	-
10. Establish training complexes, Consortium training centers, Parity-based teacher centers	18	7	5	4	2	2

*No Response

ITEM	Frequency of Ratings Given Each Item 1	2	3	4	5	NR*
11. Establish extra-legal certification systems	6	7	10	8	4	3
12. Develop standardized exercises to assess degree of skill in performing classroom tasks	12	6	9	5	5	1
13. Institute state regulated performance-based certification	12	6	13	3	2	2
14. Integrate academic disciplines in teacher education programs	10	6	12	4	5	1
15. Establish state networks of Centers for Preparation of Educational Personnel	7	7	8	11	2	3
16. Develop national confirmatory-feedback system	6	10	5	12	4	1
17. Establish "facilitating groups" to provide direction/technical assistance for ideas such as performance-based certification	8	14	10	2	2	2
18. Establish Institutional Training Centers	8	8	9	7	2	4
19. Establish Competency-Based Program Centers	8	9	11	5	3	2
20. Establish national committee for policy recommendations in training educational personnel	9	9	12	4	3	1
21. Modify college/university transcript to reflect profile of teacher competencies	10	12	5	6	3	2
22. Recruit students and adults from minority groups	17	7	7	3	3	1
23. Personalize or individualize teacher training program	26	5	4	1	1	1

Total Number of Responses = 38